



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## WOMAN'S INFERIOR POSITION IN A REPUBLIC.

BY MRS. KATE T. WOOLSEY, AUTHOR OF "*REPUBLICS versus WOMAN.*"

---

THE most serious humiliations, I remember, which my sex pride endured were suffered—first, when, yet almost an infant, I heard my father say that he was ashamed to record, in the law-book he was writing, the fact that the legal status of the white wife in his State was little better than that of the former negro slave; second, when, still a tiny girl, I heard an African member of Congress, who had been a slave in our family, say that he was opposed to adding an Amendment to the Constitution which would place the white women of the nation upon a public equality with negro men; third, when I heard native-born American ladies address a foreign-born committee of a Legislature to plead for their enfranchisement; fourth, when I witnessed a man who had emigrated from Ireland throw a petition, which was presented by numerous American ladies to his Legislature, into a Legislature's waste-paper basket, with the remark that "legislators have more important matters to attend to than the affairs of women"; fifth, when, after paying more taxes than the thirteen Colonies were expected to pay to England in six months under the stamp-act, I was told by a foreign-born member of Congress that the founders of the United States Republic had meant that "taxation without representation is tyranny" for *men* only; sixth, when I witnessed at Washington a Presidential Inauguration: as the President drove through the streets, escorted by thousands of men and witnessed by tens of thousands of citizens, I noticed that there was no woman at his side, no women in his escort, no women as attendants upon the platform, and that the whole proceeding was one of males, males, males. I fully realized then that the United States Republic is a monstrous regimen of men

—a strictly masculine monopoly, a purely male oligarchy. I fully realized then that my government was one of men, by men and for men; that I lived under the absolute and arbitrary rule of millions of male rulers, and that there were millions of women therein whose political status was no higher than that of the subjects of Turkey or China. Never before had my pride of *sex* been so cruelly humiliated.

I then recalled the fact that my Colonial ancestors, on both sides of the family, had taken up both arms and pen against English rule in America, because that government had refused them its highest recognition. I then remembered that the Colonies had possessed municipal and local self-government, with every right except representation in Parliament. But, notwithstanding all this, they repudiated English supremacy and established a new government. I then decided that I would not be a worthy descendant of my progenitors, if I did not rebel against a government which refused my sex its highest recognition, and which placed its women under the dominion of millions of males, of every condition and degree of life, from every land under the sun.

Within a few days thereafter I landed in England. The first notable sight I witnessed was Queen Victoria passing through the streets of London upon a state occasion. I observed that a state occasion in a monarchy is not an affair of males, males, males. I noted that here, in an aristocracy, a woman was at the head of the government, and I saw that woman receive more homage and honor in a few hours than the combined womanhood of the combined republics of the world had received in a hundred years. As the Queen-Empress drove about the city, I noted that there were women in her coach, that there were women in her escort. There were women in attendance when she opened Parliament; and it was obvious that this government was *not* of men, by men, and for men—a strictly masculine monopoly, a purely male oligarchy. For the first time in all my life, I lifted my head with pride of sex and was even ready to face the world! I realized that day that a woman can be the political head in a monarchy, but that in no republic can a woman ever reach this zenith and pinnacle of power.

This sharp contrast between the “first lady” in the largest democracy of earth and the first lady in the largest aristocracy

of Christendom burned into my memory. I saw that the former was the political inferior of even the lowest man in the land, and that the latter was the political superior of any of the two hundred million men in the Empire. I then looked about the city of London, and found that here, in the metropolis of a monarchy, there were streets, boulevards, parks, markets, libraries, railway stations, theatres, opera-houses, ships of the navy, regiments in the army, holidays, and other things which bore the names of native women as tributes of esteem; and I recalled the fact that in the metropolis of the Republic no such things were named in honor of American women. I soon discovered that there was not a single right, liberty, or privilege enjoyed by women in the United States Republic which the women in the British Empire had not gained; and I found that these latter had not endured the delay, the humiliation, the self-sacrifice in gaining recognition or power which the former had had to pass through. I soon saw that the United States Republic had added nothing to woman's power, influence or opportunity, either political, legal, or civil beyond what women possessed in British territory, and that it had robbed its women of many of the powers, glories, favors, honors and opportunities from which woman is not excluded by her sex in the British Empire.

I kept my counsel, however, and, as I have never been identified with the "woman cause," I said nothing publicly about it.

About ten years ago, I met a Russian lady of pre-eminent rank and great wealth who congratulated me upon being a citizen of a republic. As my allegiance to my sex is greater than it is to any theory ever established by men, I replied I could not see that being a citizen of a republic was a matter for any woman to be congratulated upon. She was amazed at this and asked me for an explanation; whereupon I asserted that I was confident that our sex had not fared so badly, either politically or legally, at the hands of the Russian government as at the hands of the United States Republic. Each of us wagered that the other was wrong; and, to settle the question, we agreed to gather certain data concerning women in our respective countries. We found—that, while in America millions of wives had no individual control over their property, for about two centuries every wife in Russia had been the legal mistress of her own fortune; that, while every woman householder in Russia had had the

right to vote on all municipal matters for several centuries, millions of women in the American Republic had no such rights; that 9000 wives were deserted by husbands in the Republic to 500 in Russia; that thousands of tiny girls were employed in factories in the Republic, while no little girls can be legally employed by Russian factories; and that more women work in the fields of the Republic than in the fields of Russia.

But I still kept my counsel. Several years ago, while again travelling in Europe, I addressed a body of women, most of whom were anarchists. Some of them were willing, however, to temporize or to compromise with constitutional and representative governments. I first addressed myself to these. I showed them that the United States Republic was a constitutional government and was based upon "no taxation without representation," but that its Constitution excluded women from its scope of justice, and that it taxed them without representation. I showed them the desperate, disheartening, cruel sufferings which women had undergone in constitutional and representative governments to gain recognition, justice or power. To the women who were uncompromising anarchists, I held up to view the anarchies in South America. I showed them that in those countries, which are anarchies pure and simple, the status of woman was far lower than that of the sex even in Oriental lands. I convinced them that the risks and efforts they were incurring in behalf of anarchism were senseless and useless, from the standpoint of being useful or beneficial to their sex, and I revealed to them that the bird they sought to capture was of the same species as that captured by republican women—the Vulture, and not the Bird of Paradise.

After delivering this lecture, I thought no more of the matter until after President McKinley was assassinated by an anarchist, when the ladies who had listened to me prevailed upon me to publish the same. I have just done so in a book called "*Republics versus Woman*." My motive in publishing the book is to convince women that neither republicanism, socialism, nor anarchism is or can become a benefit to their sex. I have shown the discontented women in the British Empire that the Colonies which broke away from English rule had seriously injured and handicapped woman thereby—that, in a British white population of only fifty million people, over five million women pos-

essed more liberal municipal suffrage than even five hundred thousand women in the United States Republic of eighty million people; and that one million five hundred thousand women in British possessions enjoyed more liberal general suffrage than even one hundred and fifty thousand women in the United States Republic. I am also showing therein the women of Italy and Spain, who are trying to foster republicanism in those countries, that in the Latin provinces which seceded from monarchical rule and set up republics, women had not advanced but had instead been lapsing back to primeval conditions. I show women anarchists the status of their sex in the republics of South America, where the very reverse of what anarchists promise in theory has happened upon experiment.

KATE T. WOOLSEY.